[Mr. Kōchikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi.]

Mr. Fletcher in believing that the discreet landlords will be the last persons to keep brothels. But we cannot tolerate landlords who undoubtedly gain much by encouraging houses of ill fame by accommodating persons of dubious character. This Bill proposes to taboo commercialised vice. It should be the endeavour of the Legal Remembrancer to see, though obviously impossible, that other evil things which might come within the domain of law and ethics also are prevented.

The amendment was put and lost.

The question that Clause 4 do stand part of the Bill was then put and carried.

Clause 4 was added on to the Bill.

Clauses 5 to 11.

The question that Clauses 5 to 11 do stand part of the Bill was put and carried. Clauses 5 to 11 were added to the Bill.

Mr. James Fletcher: Sir, I beg to move the following amendment.

Add the following as Section 12.

"Any offence under this Act will be dealt with as a bailable offence".

Sir, this Bill does not say whether the offence is bailable or non-bailable. According to the provision of the Bill an Inspector of Police can make arrest without warrant. The question to be decided is whether the offence is bailable or not.

President: Mr. Legal Remembrancer, have you examined the matter?

Mr. Puthupally S. Krishna Pillai: Yes, Sir. The Criminal Procedure Code covers the case. The last schedule deals with this matter.

The amendment was put and lost.

The Preamble and the Title.

The question that the Preamble and the Title do form part of the Bill was put and carried. The Preamble and the Title were added to the Bill.

Mr. Puthupally S. Krishna Pillai: Sir, I move that the Bill be passed.

Mr. A. Lakshminarayana Aiyar: I second it.

The question that the Bill be passed was put and carried. The Bill was passed.

MOTION REGARDING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD.

Mr. A. Gopala Menon (*Director of Public Instruction and President, Economic Development Board,*): Sir, I move that the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

question whether the Economic Development Board should continue to work on its present constitution be taken up for discussion.

The Board was reconstituted in January 1937 with 35 members, ten of whom are officials and 15 non-officials. Subsequent to that date, the number of members was raised to 32, so that at present there are ten official members and 22 non-official members. The term of the Board came to an end recently and before the constitution was renewed and a new Board was organised, Government thought it necessary to consult the Legislature with a view to ascertain their opinion as to the usefulness, need or otherwise of the Economic Development Board, and how it should be constituted.

In reconstituting the Board in 1937, Government had indicated that the "function of the Board should be to discuss al questions of policy relating to the working of the various development departments." Such a function the Board has not yet been called upon to perform. Again it has been asked "to make suggestions to Government in regard to agricultural, industrial and other matters of economic importance and to co-ordinate the work of the several development departments" In regard to this function, apart from a number of resolutions which the Board has sent up to Government from time to time, pertaining to matters of immediate economic importance of particular localities, group or class of people, nothing further has been done. Lastly, Government had said that the Board should consider important proposals and schemes sent up by individual departments or Government and make recommendations thereon. In regard to this matter five topics have been referred to the Board, on which recommendations have been made. The difficulty in these matters has been that such references are few and far between, while each locality or class or group of people might frequently send up to the Board proposals for amelioration or for investigation. These questions were examined by the Board in ad-hoc committees, committees appointed for the specific purpose from time to time, and the views of such committees were placed before the full meeting of the Board. Such meetings have to be four every year. So four times the Board meets, and each time a number of proposals was placed before the Board, which the Board discussed and on which recommendations or resolutions were submitted.

It has been found on the whole, therefore, that the purpose with which the Board has been originally constituted has not been fully satisfied, and Government came to the conclusion, though only provisionally, that a re-constitution of the Board on different lines would be desirable to make the Board more effective and

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. A. Gopala Menon.]

helpful. Government think that instead of leaving it to the Economic Development Board to constitute ad-hoc committees and instead of asking the Board to meet in full session four times every year, it would be more useful if the Board were asked to resolve themselves into sub-committees for various purposes, and each sub-committee be asked to confine itself to specific topics, discussing and studying those subjects, and the results be placed before the full meeting of the Board, which could be reduced to one or two. If this is done, the work of the Board will be more satisfactory. I think the idea of Government is that the Board should confine its attention to questions which would contribute to the economic interests of the country as a whole, and help Government to formulate policies for the welfare of the country, rather than deal with small matters of immediate local interest or significance. They wish to have what may be called "schemes of economic planning" spread over a few years and questions of policy considered in detail and placed before the Government with the full necessary particulars so that the object of the Board may be fulfilled. As it is, the Board has only to send up recommendations and what happens to their recommendations is known only when Government orders are passed. If on the other hand, the Board can itself popularise certain schemes which Government have approved, and work with popular co-operation, that will be really useful work. [*At this stage the President Vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. K. K. Kurwilla, one of the Panel of Chairmen.*] Government have no specific recommendation to make except that it appears to them that if the Board works through small sub-committees and the membership of the Board is reduced as much as possible, reducing proportionately the number of official members also, and again, if instead of meeting in full committee four times in the year, the number of meetings is reduced, the work would be more full and Government would receive greater help from the Board constituted on these lines. I have to request the House to advise Government as to the lines on which this reconstitution may be effected.

Mr. Kochikâl P. Balakrishnan Tampi: May I suggest to the House that the resolution sent up by the Assembly may be made the basis for discussion?

Chairman: You may discuss all the aspects of the question one by one.

Mr. James Fletcher: Will the mover be pleased to say whether there are rules already made for the conduct of the Economic Development Board?

Mr. A. Gopala Menon: Yes, Sir.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. James Fletcher ; Will these recommendations go against such rules ?

Mr. A. Gopala Menon : Rules were framed by Government and the Board and there is no harm in revising the rules if the constitution is changed.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai : From the statement made by the President of the Economic Development Board one thing has been made clear, *viz.*, that the Development Board has been developing nothing but itself all these years. And for that no one except Government are responsible. This House has not the slightest responsibility for the Board becoming unwieldy or for the Board becoming ineffective or for the infructuous nature of the work of the Board. Now certain vague suggestions have been put forward by the President of the Board which shows that Government themselves have not made up their mind as to how to reconstitute the Board. From the resolutions passed elsewhere certain things become evident. By limiting the number of members the Board would save some money but will not necessarily become efficient. By amalgamating it with the Board of Agriculture, by vesting power in the Board to co-opt any member for the purpose of any subject which comes up for the consideration of the Board and by aiming that the work of the Board be carried out mainly through sub-committees, these measures I think will not make much difference in the achievements of the reconstituted Board. It may probably reduce expenditure. It may possibly reduce the number of im-practicable recommendations, but if Government want to make really something out of this Board they must be prepared to do something substantial. I am definitely of the opinion that unless this Board is under a full-time officer, who will devote his whole time and attention and his capacity for finding out what is necessary for the investigation of the Board and for making the various development departments keep themselves alert with regard to the work, nothing substantial can be done. If of course the scheme of Government is different and limited to reduce the waste, these suggestions may be sufficient. The number of members may be reduced and expenditure will be accordingly reduced. If a question regarding coir is taken up our planter friends or ilmenite magnates are absolutely indifferent with regard to this subject and those experts in the committee for this purpose will be merely charging T. A. bills. Therefore I appreciate the suggestion of working by sub-committees and cooption of experts for particular topics. But I think, Sir, that these things by themselves will be of no avail. If we want the Board to really contribute towards the ambitious scheme of economic planning suggested by the President of the Board, there should not be people who

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai.]

give wrong advice. Even if you have not got very many representatives to give expert and useful advice the Board should be saved from the danger of men who do not know things. I am not keen on the representative character of the Board. I am really keen on the efficiency of the members whatever the constitution may be It is not a matter of manufacturing opinion for a particular thing it is a matter of investigating a thing and finding out what is right and useful. Therefore officials or non-officials who can really contribute for the solution of the many problems must be in the Board Representatives should be chosen on that basis alone. Government must be able to assure that and say that this expert body is concerned with the prosperity of the whole State and has no consideration for any particular community or interest and must consist essentially of persons who are capable of giving advice for the good of the whole State.— Otherwise the Board will be absolutely useless. I think, Sir, it is very necessary to have a Board of this nature reconstituted. To the recommendations made elsewhere, I would certainly add that the board must be put under the charge of a person who devotes his full time to it, I mean a Development Commissioner. He must be a man who devotes his full time; who will be responsible for its work, and who will not be responsible for the credit side of his work in any other department. The Government should pay heed to the recommendations of the Board and see that the Board works actively. Much will depend upon the choice of that one person. In the success of the choice of that person, I might say, depends the success of the Board to a very large extent. While agreeing to the suggestions made elsewhere, I confine myself to one suggestion, namely, there must be a coordinating officer who will devote his full time to the work of this Board. I do not think Government have come forward with this motion merely for the purpose of reducing the expenditure. I am glad to see that Government have themselves come forward to the House with the proposal for reconstituting the Board which has hitherto been doing little, recommending little and been ineffectual on the whole. Government have themselves, realising the futility of this Board, come forward penitently for its reconstitution. I hope that something real and substantial will be done for the reconstitution of this Board.

Mr. Kochikkal P. Balakrishnan Tampi : Sir, I am one with Mr. Kunjukrishna Pillai in thinking that the members of the Board should be chosen more on consideration of efficiency than on any other extraneous consideration. If a virtuous and good non-official gentleman, practically ineffete, goes and asks for a favour, Government, instead of sending him to this Board, could very well send him to a poor house. The present policy will have to be changed. This House also is sending representatives to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

various committees. I do not mean any disparagement to any honourable member who represents this House on the Board.

The Economic Development Board has been sending up useful suggestions to Government, especially regarding the marketing of coir, the difficulties of exporting cocoanuts and the produce of the cocoanut tree and allied subjects. Their recommendations have been extremely useful. The only grievance is that the policy of the Government had not been uniform. From time to time it has varied. Sometimes important matters used to be referred to it. At other times Government used to disregard even the useful recommendations sent up to them at the initiative of the Board. If Government give particular consideration to the suggestions made by this Board, I am sure the Board will improve in its quality. On the other hand, if the Government believe that it is some sort of debating society provided at Government expense for certain non-official gentlemen who may be rather shy or timid in the legislature, or if it is only to be a forum for some retired gentlemen to speak, then the recommendations may not be of a high order. I have also to say with regret that the official members on the committee were not mindful of their duties. If Government are pleased to look into the minutes of the meetings, they will find that some of the official members systematically absented themselves and that others who were present only took a casual interest in the proceedings. If the officials are made to feel that they are under a greater discipline than the non-officials in regard to the functioning of this Board, then certainly its quality will improve.

As regards the suggestion that there should be a full time officer for coordinating the activities of the different Development Departments or for doing propaganda work, let me inform the House that there is a full time officer in the office of the Board, a very distinguished student of economics, who is at present its secretary. I do not wish to speak anything about the President, because for one thing all know that he is particularly fitted for this sort of work. Apart from that, my friend Mr. Kunjukrishna Pillai suggested that it will be good if there is an officer, not put in charge of it in the sense that all these non-officials should be shepherded by the official President—I oppose it—but in the sense that if there is official help, the propaganda and other work of the Board would be more usefully done, I can envisage the appointment of such a propaganda officer, I second the proposal of Mr. Kunjukrishna Pillai that an officer may be appointed to do the propaganda work incidental to the successful working of this Board.

In this connection, I forgot to mention the very quiet and unostentatious work done by this Board on rural reconstruction. About fifty centres of rural work have been opened under the auspices of this Board. Thanks to the distinguished American, Dr. Hatch,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi.]

the work is being continued in such distant places as Neyyoor and Devicolam. That is an instance of the usefulness of the Board.

Limiting the number of members to fifteen is good.

In regard to the amalgamation of the Board of Agriculture—as if there is a statutory Board of Agriculture—my proposal would be to abolish that Board and have a sub-committee in the Economic Development Board to look after agriculture. The resolution of the lower House should be amended to that extent. Those esteemed gentlemen who are doing useful work in the Board of Agriculture may form a sub-committee of this Development Board.

On another consideration also, we cannot get very good work out of the departmental heads if each one of them is bothered with half a dozen committees. Their touring and supervision work will suffer. For instance, the Director of Agriculture is also the Registrar of Co-operative Societies ; he is the President of the Agricultural Board ; he is a member of the E. D. Board ; and he is a member of several Committees in Delhi or Simla for which he has been deputed by Government. In order to minimise his work it will be useful if this Agricultural Board is only a sub committee of the Development Board and the Director of Agriculture is made a Convener or President of that sub committee. If some departmental heads are appointed to several sub committees the activities of the Board and of the departments concerned will be co-ordinated. I think the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research is working through sub-committees. Much work could not be done by several people gathering together and talking without any specialised knowledge of the work concerned.

Mr. M. K. Ananthasiva Aiyar (*Nominated*) : Sir, I too endorse the view expressed by Mr. Balakrishnan Tampi that it is highly essential that the work of the Development Board should be manned by a full time officer. In regard to the reduction of the number of members of the Board, I can agree to that only under certain conditions. Travancore can be sub-divided into several physical groups, one group having absolutely no resemblance to the other either in the nature of the soil or civilisation of the people. It is highly necessary that the members of the Board should enunciate some policy after full knowledge of the locality for which they are enunciating such policy. If the number of members is to be limited, I doubt whether all these varied interests and localities will be properly represented on the Board. It will be better if every taluk could have a Board—of course without any T. A. what-so-ever to the members.

The House adjourned for lunch at 1 P. M. and reassembled at 2 P. M. with Mr. K. K. Kuruvilla, one of the Panel of Chairmen, in the Chair.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. M. K. Anantasiva Aiyar: I was saying that in order that the Economic Development Board may be enabled to be in touch with the condition of the rural areas, Boards should be constituted in every taluk under the direction of the Economic Development Board. The general prosperity of the country depends more or less upon the prosperity of the rural areas. It is a very sad thing to see people in the rural areas forsaking their places and seeking their shelter in towns. This ought not to continue. Rural areas are left most uncared for. If such Taluk Boards are constituted, it will help people who are in position to formulate policies regarding the method to be adopted by the Government. It is not every man in the State who will be in a position to formulate policies that are to be adopted by the Government with regard to the welfare of the State. Such people competent to be consulted by the Government are rare. If such competent people are available then the number might be curtailed and the Economic Development Board will be in touch with all the requirements for the development of the whole State by the information that they may get from the Taluk Boards that I have suggested.

The next thing which the other House has suggested is the amalgamation of the Board of Agriculture with the Economic Development Board. I differ from that view. The Agricultural Board is an Advisory Board consisting of a few agriculturists and some officers of the Agricultural Department. It is only a small part of the economic sphere of the State which consists of purely agriculturists.

Mr. V. Chellam Pillai: (*Thovala* cum *Agasteesvaram*): അഗ്രികൾച്ചറൽ ബോർഡിൽ അഗ്രികൾച്ചറിന്റെ എ. ബി. സി. അറിയാൻപാടില്ലാത്ത ആളുകൾ ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കുന്നതെന്തുകൊണ്ടാണ് ?

Mr. M. K. Anantasiva Aiyar: അങ്ങിനെയുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതു ഗവണ്മെന്റു തിരഞ്ഞെടുപ്പിൽ കാണിക്കുന്നസൂക്ഷ്മക്കുറവുകൊണ്ടു വരുന്നതാണ്.

Mr. V. Chellam Pillai: പൊതുജനങ്ങൾ തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കുന്ന മെംബറന്മാരെയല്ലേ ഗവണ്മെന്റു തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കുന്നതു ?

Mr. M. K. Anantasiva Aiyar: യോഗ്യന്മാരായ ആളുകളെത്തന്നെയാണ് പൊതുജനങ്ങൾ തിരഞ്ഞെടുത്തയക്കുന്നതു്.

So it will be doing more harm to the agricultural prosperity of the country in case the Board of Agriculture is dropped. Neither the Economic Development Board nor the Board of Agriculture should be found fault with for not having done anything. I may say with authority that they have been doing and are still doing all that they can. The power of carrying into effect the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. K. Anantasiva Aiyar.]

recommendations of the Board rests with the Government. If Government have not done anything the fault is with the Government and not with the Boards. I am sorry to note that the President of the Economic Development Board has stated that nothing tangible has been done by the Economic Development Board. But as a matter of fact a lot of recommendations conducive to the welfare of the State, have been sent to the Government, by the Economic Development Board. It is not the fault of the Board if they have not been carried into effect. With these words I differ from the views expressed by the Lower House.

Mr. V. Chellam Pillai : ഇങ്ങനെ ബോർഡിനെ പരിഷ്കരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് ബോർഡിൽ നിശ്ചയിക്കുന്ന തീരുമാനങ്ങൾ നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തുമെന്നതൊരു ഖ്യാതിയുണ്ടോ?

Mr. M. K. Anantasiva Aiyar : ഗവണ്മെൻറിന് മനസ്സുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തും

Mr. V. Chellam Pillai : അല്ലെങ്കിൽ ഇല്ല?

Mr. M. K. Anantasiva Aiyar : എല്ലാ ജനകീയ തീരുമാനങ്ങളേയും പ്രവൃത്തിരൂപത്തിൽ വരുത്തുന്നതു് ഗവണ്മെൻറിൻറെ മനസ്സുപോലെയാണു. ഇവിടത്തെ മാത്രമല്ല എവിടത്തെയും അനുഭവം അതാണു. അതുകൊണ്ടാണ് ബോർഡിനു ഒരു അഫീഷ്യൽ പ്രസിഡൻറ് ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കണമെന്നു ഞാൻ പറഞ്ഞതു്.

Mr. Kochikkal P. Balakrishnan Tampi : The speech is becoming bilingual.

Mr. Thomas Chandy Mukkadan (*Nominated*): സർ, ധനപരിപോഷണക്കമ്മിറ്റിയുടെ പരിഷ്കരണം സംബന്ധമായി ഇപ്പോൾ ആലോചനയിലിരിയ്ക്കുന്ന പ്രശ്നം ഏറ്റവും വിഷമകരമായ ഒന്നാണു. മുൻപ ഇവിടെ പ്രസ്താവിച്ച കാര്യങ്ങളിൽനിന്നു മനസ്സിലാകുന്നതു ധനപരിപോഷണക്കമ്മിറ്റി അംഗങ്ങളുടെ അയോഗ്യതകൊണ്ടോ അതിൻറെ പ്രവർത്തനത്തിലുള്ള ദ്വേഷ്യംകൊണ്ടോ അല്ലാ കാർയ്യക്ഷമവും ഉപയോഗപ്രദവും ആയ പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങൾ കമ്മിറ്റിമുഖേന ഉണ്ടാകാതിരിക്കുന്നതെന്നാണു. അംഗങ്ങളുടെ സംഖ്യ കുറച്ചതുകൊണ്ടോ, രണ്ടു കമ്മിറ്റികളെയും സംയോജിപ്പിച്ചതുകൊണ്ടോ, ധനപരിപോഷണക്കമ്മിറ്റിയുടെ തീരുമാനങ്ങളെ വേണ്ടവിധത്തിൽ പ്രായോഗികമാക്കിത്തീർക്കുന്നില്ലെന്നുള്ള ഇന്നത്തെ ന്യൂനത പരിഹരിക്കപ്പെടുന്നതല്ല. ആഗ്രികൾച്ചറൽ ബോർഡ എന്താണു പ്രവർത്തിക്കേണ്ടതു ധനപരിപോഷണ ബോർഡ് എന്താണു പ്രവർത്തിക്കേണ്ടതു്, എന്നു് സുനിശ്ചിത രൂപത്തിൽ ഇന്നും

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

തീരുമാനിച്ചിട്ടില്ല. ബോർഡിന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശം എന്തു്? അതു് കൈക്കൊള്ളേണ്ട നടപടികൾ എന്തെല്ലാം? ഏതെല്ലാം കാര്യങ്ങളിൽ അതിനു പ്രവർത്തിക്കാൻ കഴിയും? എന്നിങ്ങനെയുള്ള കാര്യങ്ങൾക്കു് വിശദരൂപം കൊടുക്കുകയാണു് അടിയന്തരമായി ചെയ്യേണ്ടതു്. അഗ്രികൾച്ചറൽ ബോർഡിന്റെയും ധനപരിപോഷണബോർഡിന്റെയും കഴിവുകളേയും പ്രവർത്തനവ്യാപ്തികളേയും നിർണ്ണയം ചെയ്യുന്നതിനു മുമ്പു് ഈ രണ്ടു ബോർഡുകളേയും സംയോജിപ്പിക്കുന്നതു് ആശാസ്യമല്ല. മി. അനന്തശിവയ്യർ പ്രസ്താവിച്ചതുപോലെ പ്രാദേശികമായ വ്യത്യസ്ത ധാരാളമായി ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കുന്ന ഈ രാജ്യത്തു് ഓരോ പ്രദേശത്തേയും അവസ്ഥാന്തരങ്ങളെ അപേക്ഷിച്ചു് അതാതു പ്രദേശങ്ങളിൽ ഓരോ തരത്തിലുള്ള പ്രവൃത്തിരൂപം കൈക്കൊള്ളേണ്ടതു് ആവശ്യമായിരിക്കുന്ന നിലക്കു് പ്രാദേശികമായ പ്രാതിനിധ്യം ബോർഡിനു് ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കേണ്ടതാണു്. ധനപരിപോഷണകാര്യത്തിൽ ബോർഡ് ശരിയായി പ്രവർത്തിക്കണമെങ്കിൽ ഓരോ പ്രദേശത്തിന്റെയും താൽപര്യങ്ങളെ പ്രതിനിധീകരിക്കത്തക്ക നിലയിൽ പ്രാതിനിധ്യത്തെ വിപുലമാക്കേണ്ടതുണ്ടു്. എന്നാൽ ചെലവു കുറക്കണമെങ്കിൽ പ്രാതിനിധ്യക്കുറവു് ആവശ്യമാണു്. ഒരു സ്ഥാപനത്തിന്റെ പരമമായ പ്രയോജനത്തെ കണക്കാക്കാതെ ചെലവു കുറയുകവാനുള്ള പോംവഴിമാത്രം നോക്കുകയെന്നുള്ളതു് ന്യായമല്ല. ആളുകൾ റോഡുവേണം, തോടുവേണം എന്നെല്ലാം ചോദിക്കുമ്പോൾ പറയുന്ന മറുപടി പണമില്ലാ എന്നാണു്. ഉത്തമവും ഉപയോഗപ്രദവുമായ കാര്യങ്ങൾക്കു് ആവശ്യമുള്ള പണം ഉണ്ടാക്കണം. ഇന്നത്തെ നിലയിൽ ഈ കമ്മിറ്റി പുനരുദ്ധരിച്ചു് കാര്യക്ഷമമായ പ്രവർത്തനം നടത്തേണ്ടതു് അത്യാവശ്യമാകുന്നു. ഇതു പരമാർത്ഥമാണെന്നു സമ്മതിക്കുന്ന പക്ഷം ഡെവലപ്പ്മെൻറു് ബോർഡിന്റെ ചെലവുകുറയ്ക്കുക എന്നുള്ളതിനെക്കാൾ അതിന്റെ കാര്യക്ഷമമായ പ്രവർത്തനത്തിനു്, ഒരുപക്ഷെ ചെലവു അൽപ്പം വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചാലും തരക്കേടില്ല, വേണ്ട പണം ചെലവാക്കി നന്നാവശ്യത്തെന്നതിലാണു് കാര്യമായി ശ്രദ്ധിക്കേണ്ടതു്. കാര്യക്ഷമതയ്ക്കു കുറവുവരാതെ ഞാൻ നിർദ്ദേശിക്കുന്ന മാർഗ്ഗം ഇതാണു. ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ മെമ്പർമാരുടെ സഞ്ചാരപ്പടി നേർപകുതിയാക്കി മെംബർമാരുടെ സംഖ്യ വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കണം. മെംബർമാരുടെ സംഖ്യ വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കേണ്ടതിന്റെ ആവശ്യം ഞാൻ പറഞ്ഞു കഴിഞ്ഞു. ഓരോ പ്രത്യേക കാര്യങ്ങളെപ്പറ്റി മാത്രം ചർച്ചചെയ്യുന്നതിനു് ഓരോ സബ് കമ്മിറ്റികൾ ഏർപ്പെടുത്താവുന്നതാണു്. വിദഗ്ദ്ധോപദേശം ചെയ്യത്തക്കവി

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Thomas Chandy Mukkadan.]

ധത്തിൽ ഓരോവിഷയത്തിലും പ്രത്യേകമായ ജ്ഞാനം ഉള്ള വരെക്കൂടി ഈ കമ്മിറ്റിയിൽ ഉൾപ്പെടുത്തുന്നതും നന്നായിരിക്കും. യഥാർത്ഥമായ സേവനാസക്തിയുള്ള ആളുകൾ സഞ്ചാരപ്പടി കൂടാതെ ബോർഡിൽ അംഗങ്ങളായി ചേരുവാൻ സന്നദ്ധരായാൽ ആ വിധത്തിൽ അവരെ സ്വീകരിക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള വ്യവസ്ഥകൂടി ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കേണ്ടതാണെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം." ഇങ്ങനെ ഒരു വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്യുന്ന പക്ഷം സേവിച്ചാ പ്രതിനിധ്യാവകാശം പറഞ്ഞും പടിയും വാങ്ങിച്ചുകൊണ്ടുപോകുവാനായിമാത്രം നിയമിക്കപ്പെടേണ്ടവരുടെ എണ്ണം കുറയ്ക്കുകയും ചെയ്യാം ഇന്ന ബോർഡിലുള്ള അംഗങ്ങളുടെ യോഗ്യതയെ സ്പർശിക്കുവാനോ അല്ലെങ്കിൽ അവരുടെ കാര്യശേഷിയെ ചോദ്യം ചെയ്യുവാനോ ഞാൻ തുനിയുന്നില്ല. എന്റെ ബഹുമാന്യസ്നേഹിതൻ മി ചെല്ലമ്പിള്ള കൃഷിയെപ്പറ്റി അഭിപ്രായം പറയാൻ അവകാശമില്ലാത്ത ആളുകൾ കൂടി കാർഷികബോർഡിൽ ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കുന്നില്ലേ എന്നു ചോദിച്ചപ്പോൾ മി. താണുശിവയ്യർ അതിനെ സമ്മതിച്ചു മറുപടി നൽകിയതിൽ നിന്നും ഞാനും ആളുകളും ഇന്ന് ബോർഡിൽ ഉണ്ടെന്നു മനസ്സിലാക്കാൻ കഴിയും. അതുകൊണ്ട് പ്രതിഫലം ഇല്ലാതെതന്നെ സേവനംചെയ്യുവാൻ മനസ്സുള്ള യോഗ്യന്മാർക്കും അതിനുള്ള സൗകര്യം നൽകണമെന്നാണ് ഞാൻ പറയുന്നത്.

സർ, കാർഷികബോർഡും ധനപരിപോഷണബോർഡുംകൂടി സംയോജിപ്പിക്കുന്നതു എങ്ങിനെയാണ്? ഇവ രണ്ടും പ്രത്യേകം പ്രത്യേകമായിനിന്നുകൊണ്ട് അതിന്റെ നടപടികളും നടത്തേണ്ടതാണ്. ഒന്ന് കാര്യക്ഷമതയും വിദഗ്ദ്ധാഭിപ്രായവുംകൂടിക്കലർന്നു പ്രായോഗികമായ പ്രവർത്തനത്തിന് ശക്തമായ വിധത്തിലുള്ളതായിരിക്കണം. മറെറാന്ന ഉപദേശങ്ങളും നിർദ്ദേശങ്ങളും നൽകുവാനും തീരുമാനിക്കുവാനും മറും ഉതകുന്നതായാൽ മാത്രം മതി. ഇന്നത്തെ കാർഷികബോർഡിന്റെ അദ്ധ്യക്ഷൻ കൃഷി ഡയറക്ടർ തന്നെയാകുന്നു. അദ്ദേഹത്തിനു കൃഷിസംബന്ധമായ കാര്യങ്ങളിൽ പ്രയോഗികജ്ഞാനം ഉണ്ട്. പ്രവർത്തനക്ഷമമായ ഒരു പരിപാടി നടപ്പിൽവരുത്തുവാനുള്ള കഴിവും അദ്ദേഹത്തിനുണ്ട്. അദ്ദേഹം അദ്ധ്യക്ഷനായിരിക്കുന്ന ബോർഡ് മറെറാരുബോർഡിന്റെ കീഴിലാക്കിയാൽ പ്രായോഗികമായ കാര്യക്ഷമതക്കുറവ് വരും. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഈ സംയോജനത്തോട് ഞാൻ യോജിക്കുന്നില്ല. എന്നാൽ കാർഷികബോർഡിനുകീഴിൽ ഡെവലപ്പ്മെന്റ് ബോർഡു

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

കൂടി ചെക്കുക എന്നുള്ളതു് കൂടുതൽ ആലോചനയെ അർഹിക്കുന്നു. അതും ഇന്നത്തെ നിലക്കു ആവശ്യമല്ലെന്നാണു എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം. രണ്ടുബോർഡുകളുടേയും പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങൾ തമ്മായ്ത്തിനു കാര്യക്ഷമമായ പ്രവർത്തനത്തിനു വിഘാതമുണ്ടാകാതിരിക്കുന്നതിനു ഗവൺമെന്റു നോക്കിച്ചാൽ മതിയാകും.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai : എക്കണോമിക്കു് ബോർഡിൽ കാർഷികമായ ആലോചന നടത്താൻ അധികാരം ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കുമോ?

Mr. Thomas Chandy Mukkadan: ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കണമെന്നാണു് ഞാൻ പറഞ്ഞതു്.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: മെമ്പറുടെ അഭിപ്രായം രണ്ടു ബോർഡിനും പ്രത്യേകം പ്രവർത്തനപരിധികളുണ്ടു് ഉണ്ടാകണമെന്നാണല്ലോ. അപ്പോൾ ധനപരിപോഷണബോർഡിൽ കാർഷിക വിഷയത്തെപ്പറ്റി പറയാൻ അധികാരം ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കണമോ, അതോ വേണ്ടയോ?

Mr. Thomas Chandy Mukkadan : ധനപരിപോഷണ ബോർഡും കാർഷികബോർഡും എതെല്ലാം പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങളാണു് നടത്തുവാൻ പോകുന്നതു, ഏതെല്ലാം കാര്യങ്ങളെപ്പറ്റിയാണു് ആലോചിക്കുവാൻ പോകുന്നതു് എന്നതിനെ ആശ്രയിച്ചാണു അതിരിക്കുന്നതു്. അതു മനസ്സിലാക്കാൻ കഴിയാത്തതുകൊണ്ടാണു് ഞാൻ ഇതിനെപ്പറ്റി ഇത്രയും പറഞ്ഞതും. എന്താണു രണ്ടിന്റെയും ഉദ്ദേശം, ആ ഉദ്ദേശസാദ്ധ്യതയ്ക്കായി ഓരോന്നും സ്വീകരിക്കുന്ന പ്രവൃത്തിപരിധികൾ എതെല്ലാം ഇതൊക്കെയാണു് അതുമായി നിർണ്ണയിക്കേണ്ടതു്.

ഞാൻ പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ടുവന്നതിന്റെ സംഗ്രഹം ഇതാണു്. മെമ്പറന്മാരുടെ സംഖ്യ കുറക്കണമെന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായത്തോടു് എനിക്കു യോജിപ്പില്ല. രണ്ടുബോർഡുകളെയും യോജിപ്പിച്ചാലുള്ള പ്രയോജനത്തിൽ എനിക്കു സംശയമുള്ളതുകൊണ്ടു് അതിനോടു ഞാൻ വിയോജിക്കുന്നു. ഏതു അംഗങ്ങളെ വേണമെങ്കിലും കോവാപ്റ്റുചെയ്യുന്നതിനും കൂടുതൽ അംഗങ്ങളെ ചേർക്കുന്നതിനുമുള്ള അധികാരം ബോർഡിനുണ്ടായിരിക്കേണ്ടതു് ആവശ്യമാണു്. സബ്കമ്മിറ്റികളുടെ ആവശ്യത്തെപ്പറ്റി കൂടുതൽ വിശദീകരണം വേണ്ടിവരികയില്ല. കമ്മിറ്റിക്കുള്ളിൽ നിന്നും ചില പ്രത്യേക കാര്യങ്ങൾക്കായി അംഗങ്ങളെ തെരഞ്ഞെടുത്തു സബ്കമ്മിറ്റി രൂപീകരിക്കുന്നതോ, അതൊഴിവുള്ളതിനും അധികമുള്ള

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Thomas Chandy Mukkadan.]

എടുത്തു് സബ്കമ്മിറ്റിയാക്കുന്നോ എന്നൊന്നും പറഞ്ഞുകാണുന്നില്ല. കമ്മിറ്റിയിലെ ആളുകളെ തന്നെ സബ്കമ്മിറ്റിയിലും എടുക്കുന്നതു കൊള്ളാമെന്നാണു എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം. എന്തെന്നാൽ കമ്മിറ്റിയുടെ ഉദ്ദേശങ്ങളും പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങളും മനസ്സിലാക്കിയിട്ടുള്ളവരും ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ കോശഘടനയെപ്പറ്റി അറിയാവുന്നവരും ആണ് സബ്കമ്മിറ്റിയിൽ ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കേണ്ടതു്. എങ്കിൽ സബ്കമ്മിറ്റികൊണ്ടു് പ്രയോജനം ഉണ്ടാകും. അതുകൊണ്ടുംകൂടിയാണ് ബോർഡിൽക്കൂടുതൽ അംഗങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കണമെന്നു് ഞാൻ അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടതു്.

Mr. James Fletcher: Sir, there were certain allegations to the effect that the Economic Development Board has not been functioning well. To begin with I may ask what were the functions and activities of the Board till now. In the first place I must remind the House that the Board functions only as an advisory body. The Board has been suggesting a large number of schemes of which perhaps only a few were acted upon. The reason for taking up only a few schemes is said to be lack of funds. It was also alleged that the Economic Development Board failed to suggest a sufficient number of schemes for the improvement of the economic condition of Travancore. Here also I must say that the Board has not failed in that respect. It has suggested a sufficient number and more of schemes. Previously it was the Land Revenue Commissioner who was the President of the Board. As an experienced officer of the State his experience was availed of by the Board in carrying out its functions under his direction. Lately the Director of Public Instruction became the President of the Board. He is an expert in economics and he has been a professor in the college. He knows what is needed by the people of Travancore. In addition to that he is a Travancorean himself. The consideration of the various proposals by the Board is carefully guided by the President. The suggestions and recommendations made by the Board are sent to Government and these are carried into effect by the Government only if they find them feasible. It may be asked 'why not the Board suggest a sufficient number of feasible schemes?' We know as a matter of fact that the Board has suggested a large number of feasible schemes but the Government were not prepared to spend the money for carrying them out. As for example, suppose we want a large number of cottage industries to be started in Travancore. But who is to carry it out? It is the Government. Government will certainly say that they have no funds to carry out

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the scheme. Then the Board may recommend that the existing cottage industries like hand-loom weaving should be given adequate support. Very small amounts are given by the Government as grants to these industries. So, it is not right to say that the Board has not done any work. On the other hand it is my view that the Board has functioned very satisfactorily. It is the Government's function to carry out the recommendations of the Economic Development Board.

Now, it has been suggested to limit the number of members to 15. I fail to see what magic there is in that number. Nor do I find any advantage in limiting the number of members. You can have 30 men or 50 men or 10 men on the Board. But it is necessary, as some honourable member has said, that people from all interests in Travancore should be represented in the Board. When persons from North Travancore require some special needs representatives from that part can best put forth their grievances. Similarly the interests of South Travancore can best be represented by representatives of South Travancore. Therefore it is not proper that only a particular number should be present in the Board irrespective of their representative character. I, therefore, oppose that recommendation which was made by the other House.

Another recommendation which was made by the other House was that the Agricultural Board and the Economic Development Board should be amalgamated. Now it is well known that the Agricultural Board is concerned only with the question of the agriculture in the State. So much so, it is a specialised body where every year most of the important officers of the department and other non-official members meet together to consider what has been done in the previous year and to indicate what should be done in the next year and then to make the necessary recommendations concerning the improvement of agriculture. So much so, it is a special work which is essential for the State, where agriculture is an important industry. To suggest now that the Agricultural Board and the Economic Development Board should be amalgamated to the detriment of the useful functions of the latter is a proposition which cannot be supported by this House. The Agricultural Board, as it is constituted is doing its work very satisfactorily. Lately the Board entrusted some of its members with the useful work of conducting a survey to see whether as much paddy as we need for the State could be produced in the State itself. These members have given very useful suggestions on the matter which if acted upon will enable the State to be self-sufficient in the matter of producing paddy. So much so, the Agricultural Board is now doing very useful work and let us not spoil or deteriorate its useful functioning by amalgamating it with the Economic Development Board.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. James Fletcher.]

The next recommendation made by the other House is that the Board should be invested with power to co-opt any member whose services are required in connection with the discussions of a special subject which may come up before the Board. This practice is being followed by both the Boards. They are co-opting specialists whenever a special subject comes up for discussion. When, for example, a subject relating to the development of the forests is to be considered, the Board requisitions the presence and guidance of the Conservator of Forests by co-opting him as a member of the Board. Similarly when any industrial question is to be considered, the Director of Industries is there to guide the Board. Therefore, this recommendation at present is quite unnecessary.

Mr. M. K. Anantasiva Aiyar: Do these Heads of Departments not work in the committees appointed by the Board?

Mr. James Fletcher: Yes, Sir. They work in Committees also.

Another recommendation made is that the work of the Board should be mainly carried out through sub-committees. Sir, I must say that the Agricultural Board always works through sub-committees. This is what is now generally done. On the first day of the Board meeting they consider the whole work to be done for the year in a general way after reviewing the past year's work. Then they consider ways and means for improving the work for the year. After that they form themselves into sub-committees according to the various items of work, like the improvement of manure, fruit cultivation, improvement of cattle breeding, etc. Similar sub-committees are formed by the Economic Development Board and it is these sub-committees which make recommendations and suggestions. Therefore there is no use for a recommendation like this. In conclusion, I would suggest that these recommendations may be vetoed. I suggest that the Economic Development Board and the Agricultural Board may be allowed to function as they are functioning at present.

Mr. K. M. Kesavan: Sir, I find from the speeches of several honourable members that there is much difference of opinion with regard to the number of members which the Economic Development Board should have. I heard some honourable member saying that the number should be limited to 10 and some other honourable member saying that it should be fixed at 50. I think, Sir, that fifty will be quite unwieldy and 10 will be too small a number. Because we have various interests to be represented we should have sufficient number and therefore I am of the view that the number should not be less than 20.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Then, in regard to the constitution of the Board, one half should be elected and the remaining half nominated. It was suggested by one of the honourable members that by electing or by nominating, men who are not fit to be members of the Board might come in. Well, that is a matter which this Government and the House can well look into before electing and nominating the candidates. Each honourable member should ask himself whether such and such a man is fit for the place. So also Government can by nominating efficient and useful men, men who will serve the needs of the State, avoid inefficient men coming in. The question of amalgamating the Agricultural Board with the Economic Development Board, is a matter which I think is not of vital interest. The Agricultural Board can remain quite separate and can continue to do the useful work that it has been doing. The most important point is the nomination of a full-time man who must be made the president of the Board and who should devote his whole time for the working and carrying on of it functions. I do not care whether he be an official or a non-official. If he be a non-official he should be given a decent allowance so that he may devote his entire time for the working of the Board.

Mr. V. Chellam Pillai: എക്കണോമിക് ഡെവലപ്പ്മെൻറ് ബോർഡും കാർഷികബോർഡും നിശ്ചയിക്കുന്ന തീരുമാനങ്ങളും, ഒരാ ഫീസർ പ്രസിഡൻറായി വരുന്നപക്ഷം ഗവണ്മെൻറ നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തു മെന്നു എന്താണു നിശ്ചയം ?

Mr. K. M. Kesavan: ഒരു ഓഫീസർ വേണമെന്നല്ല ഞാൻ പറഞ്ഞതു്. ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥനായാലും അനുദ്യോഗസ്ഥനായാലും മുഴുവൻ സമയവും വേലചെയ്യുന്ന ഒരാളായിരിക്കണം എന്നാണു് ഞാൻ പറഞ്ഞതു്.

Mr. V. Chellam Pillai : എന്നാലും നിശ്ചയങ്ങളും എല്ലാം നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തുമെന്നു നിശ്ചയമുണ്ടോ?

Mr. K. M. Kesavan: I am not speaking about anything done in the past. I am speaking about the future. Whatever precautions you may take, whatever be the number of members in this Board the first and foremost thing is, as I said, that Government should give a certain amount of assurance that the recommendations made by the Board will as far as possible be carried out. If there is not such an assurance, if Government are not going to seriously consider the recommendations that are made by the Board no useful purpose will be served by this Board. That is the most important point.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. Thomas Chandy Mukkadan: ശിപാർശകം നടപ്പിൽ വന്നാലും ഇല്ലെങ്കിലും പൂർണ്ണസമയവും വേലചെയ്യുന്ന ഒരുദ്യോഗസ്ഥൻ പ്രസിഡൻറായി വരുന്നപക്ഷം ഈസമിതികളെക്കൊണ്ടു കൂടുതൽ പ്രയോജനമുണ്ടാകുമെന്നുള്ളതു് മെമ്പർക്കറിയാമൊ?

Mr. K. M. Kesavan : ഇത്തരം സമിതികൾ കൂടുതൽ പ്രയോജനകരങ്ങളാകുന്നതിനുവേണ്ടിയാണു് ഞാൻ അങ്ങനെ നിർദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നതു്.

Mr. V. Chellam Pillai : സർ, ഇതേവരെ ബോർഡുകൾ ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ള ശിപാർശകളെല്ലാം നടപ്പിൽ വരാതെ വെറുതെ കിടക്കുകയാണു്. ബോർഡ് ശരിയായ രൂപത്തിൽ പ്രവർത്തനം നടത്തുന്നുണ്ടു്. എന്നാൽ ബോർഡിന്റെ തീരുമാനങ്ങളൊന്നും നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തുന്നില്ല എന്നാണു പറയുന്നതു്. ബോർഡും ശരിയായ ശിപാർശകൾ ചെയ്യുന്നില്ല എന്നു ഗവണ്മെൻറു പറയുന്നില്ലാ. കായ്ക്കലം നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തുന്നതിനു ബോർഡ് പരിഷ്കരിക്കണമെന്നാണു പറയുന്നതെങ്കിൽ അതിനെപ്പറ്റി ആലോചിക്കണം. എന്തായാലും ബോർഡു ചെയ്ത ശിപാർശകളം നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തേണ്ടതായിട്ടാണിരിക്കുന്നതു്. അതിനെപ്പറ്റി ഗവർമ്മെൻറുമെമ്പർ യാതൊന്നും പറഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ല. മെമ്പർമാരെ കൂടുതലാക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല. പടി ഒന്നു കുറച്ചാൽ ചെലവു കുറെ കുറയ്ക്കാൻ സാധിക്കും. അവർക്കാവശ്യമുള്ള പണം മാത്രം കൊടുക്കണം. അതിനു സമ്മതമുള്ളവർ മാത്രം ഇതിൽ അംഗങ്ങളായിരുന്നാൽ മതിയെന്നു വയ്ക്കണം. ആ നിലയിലും പലരും ഇതിലെ അംഗങ്ങളായിരിക്കാൻ തയ്യാറാകും. നമുക്കു പല സ്ഥലങ്ങളിലും നിന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായമാണു അറിയേണ്ടതു്. അഞ്ചോ എട്ടോ സ്ഥലത്തു മാത്രമുള്ള അഭിപ്രായം അറിഞ്ഞാൽ പോരാ. എല്ലാ താലൂക്കിനേയും പ്രതിനിധീകരിക്കത്തക്കവണ്ണം ബോർഡിൽ അംഗങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കേണ്ടതാണു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു മെമ്പർമാരുടെ സംഖ്യ കുറയ്ക്കുന്നതു ശരിയല്ല.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai : അങ്ങിനെയാണെങ്കിൽ നിയമസഭകൾ രണ്ടിലും ഉള്ള അംഗങ്ങളെ ചേർത്തു് ഒരു ബോർഡ് ഉണ്ടാക്കിയാൽ പോരെ?

Mr. V. Chellam Pillai : ഓരോ താലൂക്കിലേയും അഭിപ്രായം അറിയുന്നതിനു നിയമസഭയെ ചേർക്കേണ്ട കാര്യമില്ല.

ബോർഡിൽ അഫിഷ്യൽ മെമ്പറന്മാർ ആരും ഹാജരാകാതെ ഇരിക്കുന്നു എന്നു് ഒരു പരാതി പറയുന്നു. അതുകൊണ്ടാണൊ ബോർഡി

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

നെറ ശിപാർശകടം ഗവണ്മെൻറ് അംഗീകരിക്കാത്തതെന്ന സംശയവു മുണ്ട്. ആഫീസറന്മാരെ വെച്ചുതിക്കുന്നതു എക്സ് പെർട്ട ഒപ്പിനിയൻ അറിയാനാണ്. അവർ ബോർഡ മീറ്റിംഗിൽ ഹാജരാകാതെയിരുന്നാൽ എങ്ങിനെയാണു എക്സ്പെർട്ട ഒപ്പിനിയൻ അറിയുക? ഒന്നാലോചിച്ചാൽ ഫർണ്ടെം ആഫീസറന്മാരെ വയ്ക്കുന്നതു കൊള്ളാം. പക്ഷെ അതുകൊണ്ടുള്ള പ്രയോജനമെന്താണെന്നു മനസ്സിലായില്ല. പ്രചരണവേല നടത്താൻ കഴിയും; അതുകൊണ്ടു മാത്രം കാര്യമായില്ല. പണം ചെലവാക്കണം. എങ്കിലേ പ്രയോജനമുള്ളൂ. അതിനു ഫർണ്ടെം ആഫീസർ വേണമെന്നില്ല. അതായതു ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറിലുള്ളവരെ അക്കാര്യത്തിനു ചുമതലപ്പെടുത്തിയാൽ മതി. എന്നാലും ഒരു ഫർണ്ടെം ആഫീസർ ഇരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു ദോഷമൊന്നുമില്ല. അഗ്രിക്കൾച്ചറൽ ബോർഡ് സംയോജിപ്പിക്കുന്നതിലും തരക്കേടില്ല. കൃഷിയും ധനപരിപോഷണത്തിനുതകുന്നതാണു്. എന്നാൽ അതിലേക്ക് ഒരു സബ്കമ്മിറ്റി നിയമിച്ചു് അതിലേക്കു കൺവീനറായി കൃഷിക്കു് ഏറ്റവും പ്രധാന ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥനായ കൃഷിഡയറക്ടരെ നിയമിക്കുന്നപക്ഷം അതു ദോഷമില്ലെന്നാണു തോന്നുന്നതു്. ഇതുയും പ്രസ്താവിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു.

Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi: May I point out that the object of the Government is to understand the sense of the House without formulating definite proposals. I think the discussion of the House is sufficient to make Government understand what the House feels in the matter.

Mr. Puthupally S. Krishna Pillai: That could be known only if the House as a whole puts forward any definite proposal.

Mr. James Fletcher: May I suggest whether each of the recommendations of the Assembly has been put forward and whether this House agrees to support all the recommendations?

Chairman: We will decide first of all whether we want to reconstitute the Development Board and then put part by part to vote, and see whether we agree to all the recommendations.

The question is that the Economic Development Board be reconstituted.

Mr. T. W. U. Park: I rise to a point of order. May I know who is the mover of the motion?

Chairman: The mover of the motion is Mr. Menon.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: That is not his motion. The question is whether the Board should be reconstituted or not.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. Puthupally S. Krishna Pillai: If the House is not prepared to put forward definite views in the matter it is open to them to say so. If the House wants to record its views on the various proposals they are open to do it. As it is, only individual opinion has been expressed. If they are not inclined to express an opinion as a whole, the House may leave it at that.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: We have no time to formulate definite proposals. We want to know whether we can move now without notice.

Chairman: Yes, you can move.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: I move that the present Economic Development Board be reconstituted.

Mr. K. M. Kesavan: I second it.

The motion was put to vote and carried.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: I move that the number of members of the Board be limited to 15 of which not more than 5 shall be officials.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: I second it.

The motion was put to vote and carried.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: I move that the Board of Agriculture be amalgamated with the newly constituted Development Board.

Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi: I second it.

Mr. James Fletcher: Sir, I oppose the motion.

The motion was put to vote and carried.

Mr. James Fletcher: I demand a poll.

A poll was accordingly taken with the following results :—

AYES.

1. Mr. V. Chellam Pillai
2. Mr. Kochikkal P. Balakrishnan Tampi
3. Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai
4. Mr. N. Krishna Aiyar
5. C. N. Thuppan Nambutiri
6. Mr. P. R. Goda Varma Raja
7. Mr. G. Narayana Aiyar

NOES.

1. Mr. M. K. Ananthasiva Aiyar
2. Mr. T. W. U. Park
3. Mr. K. M. Kesavan
4. Mr. A. Easwara Pillai
5. Mr. Thomas Chandy Mukkadan
6. Miss. Thresia Korah
7. Mr. James Fletcher

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

NEUTRALS.

1. Mr. K. R. Narayana Aiyar
2. Mr. I. C. Chacko
3. Rajyasevapravina G. Parameswaran Pillai
4. Rajyasevapravina Khan Bahadur G. S. Abdul Karim Sahib Suhrawardy
5. Mr. K. P. Padmanabha Menon
6. Mr. E. G. Salter
7. Mr. K. Kunjan Pillai
8. Mr. A. Gopala Menon
9. Mr. A. Lakshminarayana Ayyar
10. Mr. Puthupally S. Krishna Pillai
11. Sahib Bahadur Abdul Tayeb Sheikh Kaderbhoy
12. Mr. V. Sankara Menon

The Chairman exercising his casting vote for the motion, declared it carried.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: I move that power be vested in the Board to co-opt any member for the purpose of any subject which comes up for consideration of the Board.

Mr. K. M. Kesavan: I second the motion.

Mr. V. Chellam Pillai: ഇതിൽ 'മെമ്പർ' എന്നു പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നു. അതു തന്നെ ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചാണെന്നു മനസ്സിലാകുന്നില്ല.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: It is very clear. It means "anybody who is co-opted as a member."

Mr. V. Chellam Pillai: അങ്ങനെയാണോ!

The motion was put to vote and declared carried.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: Sir, I move that the work of the Board be carried out mainly through sub-committees.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: I second the motion.

The motion was put to vote and declared carried.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: I move, Sir, that a full-time officer be appointed as the President of the Board to co-ordinate the activities of the various development departments.

Mr. A. Easwara Pillai: I second the motion.

Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi: I oppose it.

The motion was put to vote and lost.

Mr. Kottur Kunjukrishna Pillai: I demand a poll.

A poll was accordingly taken with the following results.

AYES—4

Mr. Kottoor Kunjukrishna Pillai
Mr. M. K. Ananthasiva Aiyar
Mr. V. Chellam Pillai
Mr. A. Easwara Pillai

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

NOES—7

Mr. James Fletcher	Mr. Kochikal P. Balakrishnan Tampi
Mr. T. W. U. Park	
Mr. K. M. Kesavan	Mr. P. R. Godavarma Raja
Mr. N. Krishna Aiyar	Mrs. Abernam Gnanasikhamony

NEUTRALS—16

Mr. G. Narayana Aiyar	Mr. A. Lakshminarayana Ayyar
Sahib Bahadur Abdul Tayeb Sheikh Kaderbhoy	Mr. K. Kunjan Pillai
	Mr. A. Gopala Menon
Mr. Tuppan Nambutiri	Mr. K. R. Narayana Aiyar
Mr. Thomas Chandy Mukkadan	Mr. I. C. Chacko
Mr. V. Sankara Menon	Rajyasevapravina Khan Bahadur G. S. Abdul Karim Sahib Suhrawardy
Miss Thressia Korah	
Rajyasevapravina G. Parameswaran Pillai	Mr. K. P. Padmanabha Menon
Mr. Puthupalli S. Krishna Pillai	Mr. E. G. Salter

The motion was declared lost, 4 voting *for*, 7 voting *against*, and 16 remaining neutral.

The House adjourned at 2-50 P. M.

V. S. ARUMUKHOM PILLAY,
Secretary to the Sri Chitra State Council.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Annexure I.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE HELD ON THE 1st DECEMBER 1941.

The first meeting of the Standing Finance Committee of the Sri Chitra State Council and the Sri Mulam Assembly constituted for 1117 M. E., was held in the Chief Secretary's room, Public Offices, at 12 noon on Monday, the 1st December 1941. M. R. Ry. Rajyaseva-pravina G. Parameswaran Pillai Avl., B. A., B. L., Ag. Chief Secretary to Government, presided under authorisation from the Dewan.

The following members were present:—

1. Sahib Bahadur T. Mahomed Ismail, B. A., LL. B., Member, Sri Chitra State Council.
2. M. R. Ry. M. R. Narayana Pillai Avl., Barrister-at-Law, Member, Sri Mulam Assembly.
3. M. R. Ry. Varkala K. Madhavan Avl., B. A., B. L., Member, Sri Mulam Assembly.
4. M. R. Ry. A. Lakshminarayana Ayyar Avl., B. A., Financial Secretary to Government.
5. M. R. Ry. C. P. Gopala Panickar Avl., B. A., B. L., Ag. Secretary to Government.

1. *Demand II—Income Tax.* The Committee approved the proposal to provide an additional allotment of Rs. 367 under 'Contingencies' under the budget head 7 (*b*)—Taxes on Income, for the purpose of payment of arrears of rent.

2. *Demand V—Registration.* Before taking up the proposal for providing an allotment of Rs. 700 under Demand V—Registration—for appointing a temporary staff to go into the question of revising the Stamp and Registration Acts, the Chief Secretary stated that the proposal needed re-examination and that therefore the matter would be brought up later on.

3. *Demand VII.—Public Works Department.* The proposal to provide a sum of Rs. 5,125 for the purpose of meeting the T. A. claims of the members of the sub-committee of the P. W. D. Advisory Committee for touring work done in 1116 and for enhancing the current year's provision of Rs. 3,750 was next considered. The Executive Engineer in charge of the Chief Engineer's duties, who was called in, explained in detail the necessity for the additional allotment. The non-official members suggested that an attempt might be made to reduce the expenditure on account of the touring work of the sub-committees in future by regulating the tours according to a programme drawn up by the Chief Engineer. The Committee agreed in this view. There-upon the proposal was approved and the provision of the sum of Rs. 5,125 was agreed to by the Committee.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly